

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Pirot. The rejection has been rejected.

With respect to claim 1, Pirot fails to disclose “abstracting and classifying the requirements into a corresponding number of classes,” as required by the claimed invention. Rather, Pirot discloses, at column 7, line 59 through column 8, line 35, and column 8, lines 16-22, that a “service management subsystem” 52 can function as a AAA-server. AAA here stands for “authentication, authorization and accounting.” After a successful authentication (by means of a password, for example), the user is granted permission in an “authorization” process to use certain “classes of services” or certain “quality levels of services.” Thus, it is known from Pirot that a user receives authorization to use finished “classes of services” already installed in a communications network.

Pirot also fails to disclose “subdividing the individual classes into at least one subclass,” as required by the claimed invention. All that is known from Pirot, column 9, lines 25-49 is that the “service life cycle” is divided into four phases; namely, the conception phase, the development phase, the deployment phase and the commercialization phase. Thus, it is known from Pirot that the “service life cycle” is divided into four phases.

Additionally, the phrase “uniquely associating a subclass...in a corresponding manner” is not disclosed by Pirot. Rather, Pirot, at column 9, lines 50-65 discloses that a “service assurance system” 58 contains an “event processing and correlation” unit 162. This unit correlates network events and alarms in order to filter, prioritize and react in an appropriate manner to these events and alarms.

We also note that the section of the Pirot citation from column 7, line 59 through column 8, line 35 describes the “service management subsystem” 52. The section of the Pirot citation that includes column 9, lines 25-49 describes the “service management and creation subsystem” 56. The section of the Pirot citation that includes column 9, lines 50-65 describes the “service assurance”

system 58, including the integrated “network and service monitoring and event collection” system 160. These systems 52, 56 and 58 are separate systems that work independently (see also Figure 3). In the Pirot, these systems do not work together to realize a “method for implementation of requirements of telecommunications subscribers for services provided by a communications network.” Rather, systems 52, 56 and 58 each have their own independent methods.

With respect to claim 4, Pirot fails to disclose a system having “a first catalog of classes, in which each requirement can be associated with one class.” Pirot simply discloses, at column 3, lines 16-21 that the telecommunications network shown in Figure 1 (which concerns language services) of data traffic between “narrowband switches” can be exchanged by means of “broadband ATM switches” or by means of “IP packet networks.” However, [the following] is not known from Pirot: [text in English]

Similarly, Pirot fails to disclose “a second catalog of technical functional units, in which each class is associated with one or more specific technical functional units.” All that is known from Pirot, column 3, lines 22-35, is that access to the data network is made possible by RANs (remote access nodes) 20. In this manner, access can be made possible for both “narrowband services” (by means of a modem or ISDN) and “broadband users” (by means of ADSL technology).

Since the recited structure and method are not disclosed by the applied prior art, claims 1 and 4 are patentable. Claims 2-3, depending from claim 1, and claims 5-10, depending directly or indirectly from claim 4, are similarly patentable.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and

authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no.449122024100. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: July 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Kevin R. Spivak

Registration No.: 43,148

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7762